to teach the importance of the instruction set simulator (ISS) being able to adapt decode and execution

behavior from the files that are used to define the system software and hardware:

> "All the goals require that the ISS 126 be able to load and decode programs produced with
> the configurable assembler 110 and linker. They also require that ISS execution of instructions
> be semantically equivalent to the corresponding hardware execution and to the compiler's
> expectations. For these reasons, the ISS 126 *derives its decode and execution behavior* from
> the same ISA files used to define the hardware and system software.

> "For the first and last goals listed above, it is important for the ISS 126 to be as fast as
> possible for the required accuracy. The ISS 126 therefore permits dynamic control of the level
> of detail of the simulation. For example, cache details are not modeled unless requested, and
> cache modeling can be turned off and on dynamically. In addition, parts of the ISS 126 (e.g.,
> cache and pipeline models) are configured before the ISS 126 is compiled so that the ISS 126
> makes very few configuration-dependent choices of behavior at runtime. In this way, all ISS
> configurable behavior is derived from well-defined sources related to other parts of the
> system."

Thus, the first paragraph of the relied-upon part of Killian teaches adapting processing behavior, not

defining a type of input data. To do this, the second paragraph teaches dynamically controlling the level

simulation, such as turning cache details on and off, and to configure parts of the ISS prior to compilation.

But nothing is said about defining data types, much less input set data types as claimed.

Applicant has also carefully considered Claussen, col. 28, lines 28-38, used as a teaching of a GUI

page based on the type, with the GUI page being generated by translating the type using a configuration file

to a class and using Java reflection to generate an instance of the class, the instance producing the GUI page.

Applicant believes that this is not what the relied-upon part of Claussen teaches:

1189-23.AM3

"The present invention uses custom DOM tags together with a framework and runtime that provides a powerful macro language to XML/JSP. The custom DOM tags allow a web page author the ability to define a simple markup language tag, e.g., <SHOPPING_CART>, that, at page translation time, is converted into script code by a generic Java object or an XSL stylesheet. This script code is then compiled into Java code and then into a Java servlet, yielding excellent performance servicing a client's request. Because the custom tag replaces the script code in the authored page, the page is kept clean and easy to maintain. The script code is kept separate and, thus, need only be debugged once. Normal ASP development, on the contrary, would force this code to remain in the page, and it would have to be debugged after every modification."

Thus, the relied-upon part of Claussen teaches allowing an author to define tags that are converted to script by Java or XSL, which is sent as a servlet. Using this feature, per Claussen, keeps the page clean and easy to maintain, requiring only one-time debugging. But there is nothing said about a GUI, much less the one claimed in which it is generated by translating a data type using a configuration file to a class and using Java reflection to generate an instance of the class. Accordingly, with respect Applicant believes the claims are allowable.

With respect to certain dependent claims, the allegation that Killian, col. 5, lines 57-64 teach a pipe input set requiring no programming apart from an initial core code as set forth in Claim 2, Applicant believes that this section of the reference teaches the opposite, that the ISS must "adapt to changes and additions".

Applicant believes that the allegation is incorrect that the above-replicated part of Killian teaches Claim 3's incremental GUI since the above-replicated part says nothing about new pipe components as claimed.

Applicant believes that the grounds for rejecting Claims 5 and 6 are *non-sequiturs* in that even if Killian teaches what is alleged, what is alleged is not what is being claimed.

CASE NO.: HSJ920030256US1
Serial No.: 10/756,123
January 27, 2008
Page 4

PATENT
Filed: January 12, 2004

The examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned for any reason that would advance this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1189 25.AM3